

power—54 cents. That is for the businesses that get a subsidy from the State of Alaska for 30 cents a kilowatt hour. The small grocery store we visited paid \$10,000 for its energy prices in January alone—\$10,000 a month for a little grocery store. They are paying \$5.19 a gallon right now, but it is going up with the next fuel barge that comes in.

Alaskans in villages who rely on diesel for their power can pay between 40 and 45 percent of their income for their energy costs. Compare that to the rest of the country, where you are looking at between 3 and 6 percent of your income going toward energy. We are paying almost 50 percent in some of our villages.

Mr. President, I don't view high oil prices as a political opportunity and neither do my constituents. What we view as an opportunity is the resource our State holds—a resource that we continue to be denied access to that opportunity. We learned late last week that the USGS has come back with an estimate that the shale oil in Alaska would come close to 2 billion barrels of oil. ANWR's estimate is about 10.6 billion barrels. In the OCS, we anticipate over 26 billion barrels of oil. We have the resources. We have the ability to access the resources and to do so in an environmentally safe way. This needs to be part of an all-of-the-above solution, in addition to everything we do with renewables and our efficiencies and conservation. We must be doing more domestically. Alaska holds the opportunity.

Again, I agree with the President that there is no short-term fix, but if we don't get started today, there is not going to be a tomorrow for communities such as Yakutat and Eek and Bethel and Fairbanks. We have to get started today.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, first let me commend my colleague from Alaska who is seeing this battle of the high price of gasoline firsthand in a State that could contribute greatly to the country's solution to the problem if the President and administration would but let it. I was led on a trip by her father several years ago to the northern part of Alaska, where there are huge untapped reserves that literally, if they had been allowed to be sent to the lower 48 at that time, could have significantly ameliorated the problem we have today. I appreciate her comments. We will talk more about that.

EARNED SUCCESS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, President Obama has ignited a national debate about the meaning of fairness and American values. In his campaign narrative, "fairness" means greater redistribution of income by the Federal

Government, and expanding government control over the economy represents what he calls a "renewal of American values." He argues that income inequality is the "defining issue of our time"—his words—and that it prevents many Americans from enjoying their right to pursue happiness.

While the President cloaks his rhetoric in the language of liberty—and often misconstrues quotations from Presidents Lincoln and Reagan in the process—his interpretations of key American concepts and values are shallow, materialistic, and distortive of the true American dream.

We don't need more government interventionist and redistributionist policies, which reduce freedom, in order to achieve greater measures of fairness and to pursue happiness. Having the government arbitrarily decide how much money should be taken from person A and given to person B is not fair in any sense of the word, nor does it make Americans happier. Indeed, even though America has become a much wealthier country during the last few decades and average income is higher, studies show that happiness levels have remained unchanged. In 1972, for example, 30 percent of Americans described themselves as happy. In 2004, 31 percent of Americans described themselves that way. That is because, contrary to what President Obama suggests, the key determinant of lasting happiness and satisfaction is not income; rather, it is what American Enterprise Institute president Arthur Brooks calls "earned success." People are happiest when they have earned their income, whatever the level. When the government tries to take all of the trouble out of life by taking care of our every need, it makes earned success that much harder to achieve.

In his 2010 book "The Battle," Brooks describes the connection between earned success and happiness:

Earned success gives people a sense of meaning about their lives. And meaning also is key to human flourishing. It reassures us that what we do in life is of significance and value, for ourselves and those around us. To truly flourish, we need to know that the ways in which we occupy our waking hours are not based on mere pursuit of pleasure or money or any other superficial goal. We need to know that our endeavors have a deeper purpose.

Earned success is attained not simply through one's vocation but also through raising children, donating time to charitable or religious causes, and cultivating strong relationships with friends and family. That is why successful parents and more religious people tend to be very happy.

The earned success that comes from doing a job also explains why self-made millionaires and billionaires continue to work hard after they have earned their fortunes. These people are driven by the satisfaction that comes from creating, innovating, and solving problems. In many cases, they are making products or providing services that improve our quality of life. They are not

content merely to rest on their laurels and enjoy their wealth; they want to continue experiencing the pride and satisfaction that comes from earned success.

The importance of earned success also explains why people who win the lottery usually wind up depressed when they discover that the excitement of being rich and buying things wears off fast. The same is true of recipients of other sources of unearned income. Studies show that welfare programs don't make people happier. We need them to help some people to subsist, but they don't yield true happiness or satisfaction because the money is not earned.

If earned success is the path to happiness, public policies should be geared toward promoting opportunity and freedom for everyone. No economic system does more to promote earned success and freedom than free market capitalism. As social scientist Charles Murray writes in his new book, "Coming Apart":

All the good things in life . . . require freedom in the only way that freedom is meaningful: freedom to act in all arenas of life, coupled with responsibility for the consequences for those actions.

In a true free market system, everyone is guaranteed equal rights and opportunities under the law, all individuals and institutions play by the same rules, and the government acts primarily as a neutral umpire, not a redistributor of income or a venture capitalist. Property rights are upheld, contracts are enforced, and hard work is rewarded. As Brooks points out, free enterprise is the only economic system that addresses the root causes of poverty by enlarging the economic pie rather than allowing government officials and bureaucrats to decide how to slice the existing one.

The President's concept of fairness is different from what most believe. I recently read an anecdote that helps illustrate the fundamental disagreement about the difference between "fair" and "earned." Two siblings are fighting about who gets the last cookie. The brother says he should get it because his sister has already had two and that is not fair. The sister responds that she helped make the cookies, so she earned it. The brother believes it is fair to equalize rewards, regardless of effort. The sister believes in meritocratic fairness—that forced equality is unfair. Those of us who believe in the ultimate fairness of the free market subscribe to the sister's view of meritocratic fairness. She earned it.

Free market capitalism is the most fair system in the world—and the most moral. It is premised on voluntary transactions that make both sides happy by meeting their needs. Unfortunately, the past few years have shown us what unfair economic policies look like.

When the government picks winners and losers in the marketplace, it is being unfair. When it rewards certain

companies or industries for ideological reasons while effectively punishing and demonizing others, it is being unfair. That is crony capitalism. When it shapes a corporate bailout to favor organized labor over secured debtholders, as the Obama administration did in the Chrysler bailout, it is being unfair. When it plays venture capitalist and gives a taxpayer-funded \$545 million loan guarantee to a doomed company such as Solyndra, it is being unfair. When it makes the Tax Code even more complex and even more tilted in favor of special interests, it is being unfair. When it adopts financial regulations that institutionalize “too big to fail,” putting taxpayers on the hook, it is being unfair. I could go on, but you get the point. Does anyone really think America’s economic system is “fairer” today than in January 2009?

Is it fair that, after the first 3 years of the Obama administration, the poor are poorer, the poverty rate is rising, the middle class is losing income, and 5.5 million fewer Americans have jobs to do than in 2007? Is it fair that the three counties with the highest median family income happen to be located in the Washington, DC, area? Finally, is it fair that the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans are constantly being attacked by the President even though they now pay nearly 40 percent of all Federal income taxes and the richest 10 percent pay two-thirds of all Federal taxes? These are some of the questions Stephen Moore recently posed in the *Wall Street Journal*.

If the President wants to continue claiming that his policies are fostering economic “fairness” and ignoring the virtues of the free enterprise system, then let the debate begin.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM H. GRAY, III

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to honor William H. Gray, III.

As I have every year since my election to the Senate, starting back in January 2007, I have come to the floor at this time of the year in commemoration of Black History Month.

This year we are privileged to honor a man whose outstanding accomplishments are of vital importance to African Americans as well as to all of America. For his entire life Bill Gray has been a minister and a shepherd for his congregation, his constituents, historically Black colleges and universities, and to all Americans in need of a stronger voice. I have known Bill Gray for a quarter of a century, and I

know his life’s work is a testament to a single principle, one that has infused all of his work at the Bright Hill Baptist Church in Philadelphia, as a Member and leader in Congress, and with the United Negro College Fund.

Bill believes in the principle of a “whole ministry,” that the church must tend to all the needs of its entire congregation. Bill grew up learning that the ministry was not just something one did on Sunday morning but, rather, the action one took in the streets on issues ranging from housing to economic justice to excellence in education. Bill has called his position as pastor of the Bright Hope Baptist Church the most important job he has ever had, one that cultivated the skills and priorities that have shaped his life’s work.

Today, I am proud to share some of the achievements that have resulted from Bill Gray’s dedication to a “whole ministry.”

Bill grew up in a family of educators and ministers who taught him the value of both professions to empower others. He was born in the State of Louisiana to parents who were both educators. His father was president of two historically Black colleges: Florida Normal and Industrial College and Florida Agricultural and Mechanical School. His mother was both a high school teacher and served as dean of Southern University in Baton Rouge, LA.

When Bill was 8 years old, his grandfather passed away and the family moved from Louisiana back to Philadelphia, PA. There in Philadelphia, Bill’s father assumed his own father’s position as pastor of the Bright Hope Baptist Church in north Philadelphia, and Bill cemented his roots in that community. He has spoken of the powerful impact of those years, moving from a region where Jim Crow laws reigned to a large northern city where his family had strong ties to other clergy and community leaders. Because of de facto segregation in housing at the time, north Philadelphia was a neighborhood with African Americans from all walks of life, including many role models for the young Bill Gray.

Hobson Reynolds across the street was the leader of the Elks. Cecil B. Moore, a future member of the city council and head of the NAACP of Philadelphia, lived two doors down from Bill’s family at the time. Other neighbors included the renowned architect Frederick Messiah and Sadie Alexander, the first woman of any race to obtain a Ph.D. in economics in the United States of America.

Of course, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a frequent visitor to Bill Gray’s home at that time, as were Dr. King’s parents who were close family friends of Bill Gray’s family. Both the elder and younger Kings as well as other ministers influenced Bill’s understanding of the “whole ministry” and encouraged his education and career as a minister.

Bill graduated from Simon Gratz High School and went on to Franklin and Marshall College. When Bill considered leaving Franklin and Marshall before graduation to join civil rights protests in the South, Dr. King encouraged him to stay in school and to hone the skills necessary to continue the struggle later in life. This idea of education as a key to African-American advancement would guide Bill for the rest of his life.

Bill graduated from Franklin and Marshall, and in 1966 he obtained a master’s degree in divinity at Drew Theological Seminary and in 1970 a master’s degree in theology from Princeton Theological Seminary. While at Drew, Bill’s talents were recognized by the prestigious Union Baptist Church in Montclair, NJ, and he was later chosen to be a pastor there as well. The King family presided over the installation ceremony.

In his first parish, Bill Gray worked to serve the “whole community,” advocating aggressively for the needs of his congregation and the community’s most vulnerable members. As the city of Montclair undertook urban renewal, he helped to form a development corporation to ensure that relocation resulted in safe, decent housing for his parishioners and their neighbors. This issue of housing hit Bill Gray personally when he tried to rent an apartment while studying at Princeton and was told the unit was unavailable. He sensed immediately that it was because of his race, and he found a friend who was White who volunteered to go look at the apartment, at which point the landlord said it was open.

Bill filed a lawsuit and for the first time sought damages for the psychological impact of discrimination. While the monetary award was small, his victory in the suit set a precedent that those who discriminated based on race could be held liable for monetary damages.

In 1971 Bill married Andrea Dash, with whom he has raised three sons, William IV, Justin, and Andrew. In 1972 Bill’s father died unexpectedly and tragically, and the congregation of Bright Hope Baptist Church called on Bill to return home as the new pastor. Bill was reluctant to go back as the preacher’s son, but two church elections finally convinced him to return. He became the third generation of his family to serve as pastor of Bright Hope. Under his leadership, the congregation quickly grew to over 4,000 souls.

Bill also taught as a professor at Jersey City State College from 1968 to 1969, St. Peter’s College in Jersey City from 1970 to 1974, Montclair State College from 1970 to 1972, and Rutgers University in 1971. He also continued his important advocacy on fair access to housing, and he cofounded the Philadelphia mortgage plan to help low-income individuals obtain homes.

This dedication to helping his community and concern about their welfare led him back to the political